REMARKS

1
2   At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Campbell for the
3   courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephone interview of 2 October
4   2005. During this interview, the parties discussed a draft response transmitted by
5   the Applicant to the Office by e-mail on 29 September 2005. During the telephone
6
7   interview on the 2nd, the Applicant understood that the Office indicated that the
8   claim revisions and related remarks contained in the draft response, and carried
9   forward herein, were likely to overcome the art currently cited in this application.
10 However, the Office indicated that it would update its search in response to the
11 claims revisions and remarks herein. The Applicant submits that the foregoing
12 provides a Statement of the Substance of the Interview sufficient under 37 CFR §
13
14 1.133(b).
15

16   Turning the instant response, the Applicant submits this paper as a fully-
17 responsive reply to the Official Action mailed by the Office on 25 July 2005
18 (hereinafter the "Action"). A three-month shortened statutory period for response
19 was set in the Action. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this paper is timely
20 filed on or before 25 October 2005.
21

22   The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the
23 rejections stated in the Action.
24

25   Claims 1-10 and 12-27 are pending in this application.

§103 Rejections

Paragraph 3 of the Action stated a rejection of **Claims 1-10 and 12-27** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neibauer (The ABCs of WordPerfect 8, published in 1997) in view of US Patent No. 6,480,206 to Prinzing (hereinafter, "Prinzing"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant has amended **independent claim 1** as indicated above to clarify further features of the electronic document editor. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended above, with redlines included:

"1.   (Currently Amended) ~~In an~~ An electronic document editor~~, a highlight rendering services component~~ comprising:

a highlight rendering services component including a highlight rendering services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to control which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen and to control a style of the highlight, the editor extension determining a visual aspect of the highlight without altering the electronic document and the highlight rendering services component determining non-visual functional aspects of the highlight;

a designer extensibility mechanism;

a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the highlight rendering services component;

a designer registry containing respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are

arranged in sequential order; and

an event routing controller adapted to route events related to the highlight rendering

services component to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order

of the entries in the designer registry."

These revisions are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st

paragraph, at least by the Applicant's Figures 2 and 3, and at least by related

description appearing in the Applicant's specification at: page 12, lines 10-22;

page 14, lines 10-14; and page 15, lines 6-11. More particularly, the "designer

extensibility mechanism" as recited in claim 1 is denoted by the reference sign 210

in Figure 2. The "designers" as recited in claim 1 are denoted by the reference

signs 216, 218, and 220 in Figure 2. The "designer registry" as recited in claim 1

is denoted by the reference sign 303 in Figure 3. Finally, the "event routing

controller" as recited in claim 1 is denoted by the reference sign 302 in Figure 3.

Turning to the cited art, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither

Neibauer nor Prinzing teach or suggest an electronic document editor having the

features recited above in claim 1. Neibauer is an excerpt from a user manual for

the WORDPERFECT® word processor, but neither teaches nor suggests

extensions to a document editor.

Turning to the secondary reference, Prinzing, the Applicants agree that

Neibauer does not disclose a method in which the non-visual and visual aspects of

the highlight are determined by separate extensions, as stated in Paragraph 4 of the

Final Action. Thus, the Office cited Prinzing as a secondary reference, more

particularly, column 2, line 55 through column 4, line 14 of Prinzing. While

Prinzing may refer to various aspects of a method and apparatus for an extensible

editor, the Applicant respectfully submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor

suggests at least the following features recited in claim 1:

"a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic

document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the highlight

rendering services component;

a designer registry containing respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are

arranged in sequential order; and

an event routing controller adapted to route events related to the highlight rendering

services component to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order

of the entries in the designer registry".

Prinzing's Figures 3 and 4, for example, illustrate paragraph style objects

and paragraph view objects, respectively. Prinzing also references a hierarchy for

organizing text in, for example, column 2, lines 44-54. However, the Applicant

submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor suggests at least the foregoing features

that are recited in the Applicant's claim 1.

Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Neibauer and

Prinzing, whether considered severally or in combination, do not support a § 103

LEE & HAYES, PLLC   16   070021

PAGE 18/20 * RCVD AT 10/20/2005 2:06:59 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/30 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:15093238979 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-46

rejection of claim 1 because they do not teach or suggest at least the above features recited in claim 1. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 1. These comments apply equally to claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1 and stand rejected on similar grounds.

Independent claims 10, 17, and 22 are amended to clarify further aspects of the computer readable medium, the method, and the electronic document editor, respectively. More particularly, claims 10, 17, and 22 are amended to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 above. Thus, the above comments directed to claim 1 regarding 112, 1st paragraph, support apply equally to claims 10, 17, and 22. Additionally, the above comments regarding the cited art of Neibauer and Prinzing apply equally to claims 10, 17, and 22.

Dependent claims 12-16 depend from independent claim 10, and stand rejected on similar grounds. Dependent claims 18-21 depend from independent claim 17 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Dependent claims 23-27 depend from independent claim 22 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the foregoing comments apply equally to these dependent claims 12-16, 18-21, and 23-27.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of Claims 1-10 and 12-27 as stated in the Action. If personal discussion would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 20 oct 05

By: _____
Rocco L. Adornato
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256; x257

18